

2. Remarks

The Examiner has rejected pending claims 1, 6-10, 12, and 15. No claims have been added, cancelled, or amended.

A. *Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. § 102*

Claims 1, 6, 7, 12, and 15 have been rejected as being anticipated by Roy et al. The applicant respectfully submits that the claims are allowable over Roy et al. for the following reasons.

The co-browsing system of Roy et al., like several of the prior art systems discussed in the background section of the present application, relies on the user to download a software application or “applet” in order to engage in co-browsing. The present invention, as claimed, does not require the download of any such software, but rather is capable of functioning with only a standard web browser at the customer computer. The present invention overcomes the requirement of downloading specialized software or “applets” by its novel use of a polling routine.

The Examiner has asserted that Roy et al. teaches such a polling routine at column 2, lines 35-43, and/or at column 11, line 63 to column 12, line 6.

These two sections are reproduced, in full, below:

In one embodiment of the invention, a system and methods are provided for facilitating the collaborative co-browsing of a document or web page. In this embodiment, collaborators operate client browsers that are augmented, for purposes of the collaboration, with a collaboration applet. The applets are configured to communicate with a collaboration server to relay information about co-browsing events and pages to be co-browsed.

Thus, one or more hyperlinks within the page may be modified (e.g., by javascripts and/or the collaboration applet) to point to the collaboration server instead of their original targets. Script event handlers may be added to the browser's document object model. For example, event handlers may be added for fields of a form, so that each value input to the form is communicated back to the collaboration server. Other script or page code may be added to facilitate the communication of scrolling, highlighting and pointing events from one attendee (e.g., the host) to the collaboration server and the other attendees.

Neither of these sections teach or even mention a polling routine of any kind, much less the polling routine claimed by the applicant.

When reciting the quoted language above in the final Office action, the Examiner inserted in brackets the language that the applet "communicates with polling status from the server." This language does not actually appear in the quoted language from Roy et al., or anywhere else in Roy et al. In fact, it is clear that the applet of Roy et al. does not involve the use of a polling technique. The purpose of the Roy et al. applet, as set forth in the quoted language above, is simply to relay information. Specifically, as described in the second quoted section, the applet may be used to modify hyperlinks within a web page to point to the collaboration server rather than the original target of those hyperlinks, and thus to facilitate co-browsing. This function has nothing to do with polling. In the present invention, by contrast, the polling routine makes it possible for the user of the applicant's invention to dispense with applets, and instead to use only an unmodified browser application at the customer computer.

For these reasons, Roy et al. neither teaches nor suggests a polling routine as set forth in the present claims, and for this reason Roy et al. does not teach or suggest the invention of the present claims.

B. Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 8-10 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Roy et al. in view of the Examiner's "official notice" concerning the use of contact information and telephone numbers. Each of these claims are dependent upon claim 6, and the applicant thus asserts that they are allowable over Roy et al. in view of the official notice for the same reasons as presented above with respect to claim 6.

C. Conclusion

In light of the amendments presented herein and the arguments presented above, the applicant asserts that all claims remaining in the application are allowable, and reconsideration and allowance is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

11/24/2010

/chuck dougherty/

Date

Reg. No. 41,715
Telephone: (501) 371-0808
Facsimile: (501) 376-9442
Customer No.: 47990

J. Charles Dougherty
Wright, Lindsey & Jennings LLP
200 W. Capitol Avenue, Suite 2300
Little Rock, AR 72201-3699